

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,293	07/24/2003	Mark Alan Robbins	14697	1863
7590 04/06/2005			EXAMINER	
S. Wade Johnson DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP Intellectual Property Department Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498			SHAW, ELIZABETH ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	
			DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/626,293	ROBBINS, MARK ALAN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Elizabeth A. Shaw	3644
The MAILING DATE of this comm Period for Reply	unication appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU - Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reany reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	INICATION. ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a mmunication. ((30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of third n statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ply will, by statute, cause the application to become AB is after the mailing date of this communication, even if	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s)	filed on 24 July 2003.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition	on for allowance except for formal matt ctice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	•
Disposition of Claims		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 37-43</u> is/are allo 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19-25 and 30-36</u> is/are re 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>26-29</u> is/are objected to.	s/are withdrawn from consideration. owed.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/a	re: a)∟_ accepted or b)∟_ objected to pjection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	•
	ing the correction is required if the drawing	• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected		• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
2. Certified copies of the priori3. Copies of the certified copiesapplication from the Internal		opplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	_	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review 	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
 Rolice of Draitsperson's Faterit Drawing Review Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/24/03</u>. 		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3644

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 19-25, 30, 32-34 and 36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,561,133. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both disclose a method of modifying a foraging distribution of animals comprising the steps of selecting a foraging area encompassed by the foraging distribution and supplying the foraging area with an ingestible to be ingested by a foraging animal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3644

Claims 19-23, 25 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liegner (5,050,539). Liegner teaches a method of attracting foraging animals such as deer into an area having abundant forage comprising identifying the area with abundant forage, providing at least one ingestible such as a highly-palatable, portable, self-limiting low moisture block 38, consisting of a pressed block of salt in a portable container 10 to the area to be ingested by any ungulate, wild or preconditioned and to increase the length of stay of the animals in the area, see col. 2, lines 8-12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Liegner (5,505,539) in view of Robbins (6,244,217)

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR

1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See

Liegner does not disclose the use of other supplements. Robbins '217 teaches the use of other ingestibles, see col. 7, lines 11-35 for use with animals such as cattle, horses, sheep, deer and elk. With respect to claim 24, to use other ingestibles such as grain or silage as taught by Robbins with the dispenser of Liegner would have been obvious to one skilled in the art as a replacement of functional equivalents.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-18 and 37-43 are allowed.

MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Claims 26-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Shaw whose telephone number is 703-308-

Art Unit: 3644

1853. After April 4, 2005, please use the following phone number: 571-272-6908. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 703-305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elizabeth A. Shaw

Examiner Art Unit 3644

March 24, 2005

TERI PHAM LUU SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER